arXiv:1604.04901v2 [math.GT] 26 Apr 2016

ON THE UPSILON INVARIANT AND SATELLITE KNOTS

PETER FELLER[†], JUNGHWAN PARK, AND ARUNIMA RAY[††]

Abstract. We study the effect of satellite operations on the Upsilon invariant of Ozsváth–Stipsicz–Szabó. For instance, it is straightforward to show that the Upsilon invariant for a Whitehead double contains no more information than the τ–invariant. As a corollary we get that the smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number of topologically slice knots can be arbitrarily large. We obtain results concerning when a knot and certain satellites are independent. For example, we show that for D the positive clasped Whitehead double of any knot with positive τ–invariant, $\{D, D_{p,\pm 1}\}$ is linearly independent in the group of topologically slice knots for any $p \geq 2$. We also show that the set $\{D_{2^i,1}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a basis for an infinite rank summand of the group of topologically slice knots. We prove that the image of the Mazur satellite operator on the smooth knot concordance group contains an infinite rank subgroup of topologically slice knots.

1. Introduction

Ozsváth–Stipsicz–Szabó recently introduced the Upsilon invariant of a knot K, denoted Υ_K, in [OSS14]. This invariant considers strictly more of the information contained within the Heegaard–Floer complex $CFK^\infty(K)$ of a knot K than the τ–invariant, and is particularly well-suited to studying linear independence of families of knot concordance classes.



Figure 1. The (untwisted) satellite operation on knots. The box containing '3' indicates that all the strands passing vertically through the box should be given three full positive twists, to account for the writhe in the given diagram of K.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the smooth knot concordance group. Via the classical satellite construction, given a knot P in a solid torus, called a *pattern*, and any knot K (called the *companion*), we obtain the *satellite knot* $P(K)$, by tying the solid torus containing P into the knot K (see Figure 1). It is well-known that any pattern P yields a function on $\mathcal{C}$, called a *satellite operator*, given by $K \mapsto P(K)$ for any knot K. The *winding number* of a pattern (or satellite operator) P is the algebraic intersection of P with a generic meridional disk of the solid torus containing P. Let U denote the unknot. If

Date: April 27, 2016.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57M25.

[†] Partially supported by Swiss National Science Foundation Grant 155477.

[††] Partially supported by an AMS–Simons Travel Grant.

$P(U)$ is topologically slice for a pattern P, then it is easy to see that $P(K)$ is topologically slice whenever K is topologically slice, and thus, if $\mathcal{T}$ denotes the group of smooth concordance classes of topologically slice knots, any pattern P with $P(U)$ topologically slice yields a satellite operator $P : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$.

The primary goal of this paper is to demonstrate the power of the Upsilon invariant in addressing questions about linear independence of satellite knots, in C or $\mathcal{T}$. Our proofs depend on geometric constructions and topological properties of Υ without explicit use of Heegaard–Floer theory.

There has been considerable interest in understanding how satellite operators interact with concordance. For example, it is a long-standing open question [Kir97, Problem 1.38] whether the Whitehead double of a knot K is smoothly slice if and only if K is smoothly slice; in other words, what is the kernel of the satellite operator $\mathrm{Wh} : C \to C$? (Note that satellite operators are rarely homomorphisms.) A generalization of this question would be to ask whether the Whitehead doubling satellite operator preserves linear independence. In [HK12], Hedden–Kirk showed that Whitehead doubling preserves the linear independence of certain families of torus knots using moduli spaces of instantons and Chern-Simons invariants of flat connections. We show that the Upsilon invariant of Whitehead doubles of a knot K contains no more information than the τ–invariant of K; in particular, the Upsilon invariant cannot be used to recover Hedden and Kirk's result.

Proposition 3.2. Let $* \in \{+, -\}$, and let $\mathrm{Wh}^*_k(K)$ denotes the $*$–clasped k–twisted Whitehead double of the knot K. Then,

$$\Upsilon_{\mathrm{Wh}^+_k(K)}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \geq 2\tau(K) \\ -1 + |1 - t| & \text{if } k < 2\tau(K) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Upsilon_{\mathrm{Wh}^-_k(K)}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \leq 2\tau(K) \\ 1 - |1 - t| & \text{if } k > 2\tau(K) \end{cases}$$

The above result shows that the Υ–invariant for Whitehead doubles are of a specific form, as we define below.

Definition 1.1. A knot K is called Υ-simple if

$$\Upsilon_K(t) = \tau(K) \cdot (-1 + |1 - t|)$$

That is, a knot K is Υ–simple if Υ_K has at most one singularity; if there is a singularity it occurs at $t = 1$. Specifically, K is Υ–simple if Υ_K is determined entirely by $\tau(K)$. There are several known families of Υ–simple knots, e.g. quasi-alternating knots [OSS14, Theorem 1.14], knots with $g_c(K) = 1$ (see Proposition 3.1), including, as we saw above, Whitehead doubles and generalized Whitehead doubles (see Corollary 3.4), which are often topologically slice. Moreover, Υ–simple knots form a subgroup of C.

For a knot K, let $\gamma_4(K)$ denote the minimum first Betti number of a smoothly embedded, connected, compact, possibly non-orientable surface bounded by K in B^4. The quantity γ_4 is called the *smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number* of K. In [Bat14, Theorem 2], Batson showed that the smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number of torus knots can be arbitrarily large. More recently in [OSS15, Corollary 1.4] Ozsváth–Stipsicz–Szabó showed that the smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number of connected sums of $T_{3,4}$ is arbitrarily large. To add to these results, as a corollary of Proposition 3.2, we show that the smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number of topologically slice knots can also get arbitrarily large. This is obtained by noting, via [OSS15], that for a topologically slice Υ–simple knot K, $|\tau(K)| \leq \gamma_4(K)$.



FIGURE 2. The Mazur pattern. We reserve the symbol M for this pattern and the corresponding satellite operator on C or $\mathcal{T}$, which we call the *Mazur satellite operator*

Corollary 3.5. Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) > 0$. Then $k \leq \gamma_4(\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K))$ for any positive integer k. Thus, the smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number of topologically slice knots can be arbitrarily large.

Winding number one satellites under patterns P with $P(U)$ slice are particularly interesting to study since, for any knot K, the 0–surgery manifolds of K and $P(K)$ are homology cobordant preserving the homology class of the positively oriented meridian (i.e. homology cobordant *rel meridians*), and as a result they have the same classical concordance invariants. In [CFHH13], it was shown that there exist infinitely many non-concordant knots with 0–surgeries that are homology cobordant rel meridians. More recently Yasui showed in [Yas14] that there exist non-concordant knots with homeomorphic 0–surgeries, disproving a conjecture of Akbulut–Kirby from 1978 [Kir97, Problem 1.19]. The examples in both [CFHH13] and [Yas14] are satellite knots. Using the Upsilon invariant, we show the following.

Corollary 4.9. There is an infinite family of pairs of knots $\{(K_i, J_i)\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ such that

(1) $\{K_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent in C.
(2) $\{J_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent in C.
(3) For each i, K_i and J_i are satellites with the same companion, under winding number one patterns M and Q such that $M(U)$ and $Q(U)$ are slice.
(4) $\{K_i, J_i\}$ is linearly independent in C for each i, even modulo changing the orientation of the knots,
(5) each K_i and J_i can be chosen to be topologically slice,
(6) the 0–surgery manifolds on K_i and J_i are homeomorphic, for each i.

It was recently conjectured by Cochran–Harvey–Leidy in [CHL11] that some satellite operators are *self-similarities*, which reveal a fractal structure on C. This was corroborated in [CDR14], where it was shown that infinite classes of winding number one satellite operators (e.g. the Mazur satellite operator shown in Figure **??**) are injective modulo the smooth 4-dimensional Poincaré Conjecture. Moreover, A. Levine showed in [Lev14] that each iterate of the Mazur satellite operator (i.e. each iterated function M^i for $i \geq 1$) is non-surjective on C.

In contrast, we show that the image of each iterate of the Mazur satellite operator is still 'large', even when only looking at the set of topologically slice knots $\mathcal{T}$. This is made precise in the following.

Theorem 4.8. There exists an infinite family of topologically slice knots $\{K_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all non-negative integers r, $\{M^r(K_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ generates a subgroup of C of infinite rank.

From another perspective, the above result shows that the iterates of the Mazur satellite operator preserve the linear independence of certain families of topologically slice knots.

In Section 5, we prove several results about the linear independence of a knot from its cables, and of families of cables and iterated cables. Our main tool is Chen's inequality for Υ of cable knots from [Che16], which allows us to find bounds on where the singularities of the Υ–functions may occur.

Corollary 5.8. If K is an Υ–simple knot with $\tau(K) \neq 0$, then $\{K, K_{p,q}\}$ is linearly independent in C for any p, q with $p \geq 2$.

Corollary 5.15. For any Υ–simple knot K with $g_4(K) = \tau(K) > 0$, the sequence $\{K_{2^i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent.

Corollary 5.16. For any knot K with $\tau(K) \neq 0$, we can find a sequence $\{p_i\}$ such that the family of iterated cables $\{K, K_{p_1,1}, K_{p_1,1;p_2,1}, K_{p_1,1;p_2,1;p_3,1}, ...\}$ is linearly independent in C.

For many knots and cabling parameters, the above can be shown using the Levine–Tristram signature. However, the above result can be applied to topologically slice knots K with $|q| = 1$ (see Corollary 5.17), where Levine–Tristram signatures do not apply. For example, Corollaries 5.8, 5.15, and 5.16 apply to the Whitehead doubles of knots with positive τ–invariant.

We also prove the following result about when a family of knots is a basis for an infinite summand of C.

Theorem 5.21. For any Υ–simple knot K with $\tau(K) = g_4(K) = g_c(K) = 1$, the knots $\{K_{2^i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ form a basis for an infinite summand of C.

For topologically slice knots, we obtain the following.

Corollary 5.22. Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) > 0$. Then $\{\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)_{2^i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is a basis for an infinite rank summand of $\mathcal{T}$.

Note that the above yields bases for infinite rank summands of $\mathcal{T}$ consisting of knots with trivial Alexander polynomial. This should be compared to [KP16] where Kim–Park showed that $\{\mathrm{Wh}^+(RHT)_{n,1}\}_{n=2}^{\infty}$ is a basis for an infinite rank summand of C. There the authors performed an explicit computation of part of the Υ–invariant of $\mathrm{Wh}^+(RHT)_{n,1}$, for $n \geq 2$. Our techniques are comparatively indirect, and do not address the complete family of $(n, 1)$ cables of $\mathrm{Wh}^+(RHT)$, but apply to a larger family of all Υ–simple knots. The existence of an infinite rank summand of $\mathcal{T}$ was first shown by Hom in [Hom15] using her ε–invariant, and later by Ozsváth–Stipsicz–Szabó in [OSS14] using their Υ–invariant.

We finish Section 5 by investigating the case of knots with vanishing τ–invariant, but non-vanishing Υ–invariant. Here is a sample result.

Corollary 5.29. Let $K = \mathrm{Wh}^+(RHT)$. Let $J_n = 2nK\# - K_{2n,1}$. Then $\{J_n, (J_n)_{p,\pm 1}\}$ is linearly independent in C for any $p > \frac{1+2n}{2}$. In particular $\{J_1, (J_1)_{p,\pm 1}\}$ is linearly independent in C for any $p \geq 2$.

Lastly, we note in passing that this project was motivated by the following question.

Question 1.2. Does there exists a knot K such that $\{M^n(K)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is linearly independent in C, or better, is a basis for a free direct summand of C? If yes, can this knot be chosen to be topologically slice?

In [Ray15] it was shown that there exist knots K, including infinitely many topologically slice knots, such that the iterated satellites $M^n(K)$ are all distinct; this was shown using the τ–invariant. Since Υ can be seen as a generalization of τ, the above is a natural followup question. We do not currently know the answer to Question 1.2.

Acknowledgements. The second author would like to thank his advisor Shelly Harvey for her guidance and helpful discussions.

2. Preliminaries

We start by formally stating what it means for a subset of an abelian group to be linearly independent.

Definition 2.1. Let G be an abelian group. A subset $A \subseteq G$ is said to be *linearly independent* if every n–element subset of A generates a free abelian subgroup of G of rank n. A subgroup of G is said to have *infinite rank* if it contains an infinite linearly independent subset.

A subset $A \subseteq G$ is said to be a *basis* for a free summand of G if A is linearly independent and the subgroup F of G that it generates is a factor of G, i.e. there exists a subgroup $H \leq G$ such that $G = F \oplus H$.

For ease of reference, we summarize below some of the properties of the Υ–invariant from [OSS14, OSS15].

Proposition 2.2 ([OSS14, OSS15])**.** *For any knot K, the Upsilon invariant, denoted Υ_K, is a piecewise linear function $\Upsilon_K : [0,2] \to \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties.*

(1) [OSS14, Corollary 1.12] *Υ is a concordance invariant, i.e we have a homomorphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon : C &\to Cont[0,2] \\ K &\mapsto \Upsilon_K \end{aligned}$$

where $Cont[0,2]$ is the vector space of continuous functions on $[0,2]$. Υ does not depend on the orientation of the knot, i.e. if rK denotes the reverse of the knot K, $\Upsilon_K = \Upsilon_{rK}$.

(2) [OSS14, Proposition 1.2] *$\Upsilon_K(t) = \Upsilon_K(2-t)$ (symmetry).*

(3) [OSS14, Proposition 1.4] *Each of the finitely many slopes of Υ_K is an integer.*

(4) [OSS14, Proposition 1.5] *$\Upsilon_K(0) = 0$.*

(5) [OSS14, Proposition 1.6] *The slope of Υ_K at $t = 0$ is given by $-\tau(K)$.*

(6) [OSS14, Proposition 1.7] *For any $t \in [0,2]$, $t \cdot \Delta\Upsilon'_K(t)$ is an even integer, where*

$$\Delta\Upsilon'_K(t_0) = \lim_{t \to t_0^+} \Upsilon'_K(t) - \lim_{t \to t_0^-} \Upsilon'_K(t)$$

for any $t_0 \in [0,2]$.

(7) [OSS14, Proposition 1.10] *Let K_+ and K_- be two knots where K_- may be obtained from K_+ by changing a positive crossing to a negative crossing. Then, for $0 \leq t \leq 1$,*

$$\Upsilon_{K_-}(t) - t \leq \Upsilon_{K_+}(t) \leq \Upsilon_{K_-}(t)$$

(8) [OSS14, Theorem 1.11] *For $0 \leq t \leq 1$,*

$$|\Upsilon_K(t)| \leq t \cdot g_4(K).$$

(9) [OSS14, Theorem 1.13] *Let s denote the maximum of the finitely many slopes appearing in the graph of $\Upsilon_K(t)$. Then,*

$$s \leq g_c(K).$$

(10) [OSS15, Theorem 1.2] *Let $\upsilon(K)$ denote the value $\Upsilon_K(1)$, and $\gamma_4(K)$ denote the smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number of K. Then*

$$\left| \upsilon(K) - \frac{\sigma(K)}{2} \right| \leq \gamma_4(K)$$

The following observation is immediate from Proposition 2.2.

Observation 2.3. *Let m_1 and m_2 be two consecutive slopes in Υ_K for a knot K, i.e. there is some point $t_0 \in (0,1]$ where the slope of Υ_K changes from m_1 to m_2, and $m_1 \neq m_2$. Then $|m_2 - m_1| \geq 2$. Moreover,*

(1) $t_0 \in \left\{ \frac{2}{|m_2-m_1|}, \frac{4}{|m_2-m_1|}, \cdots, \frac{2\lfloor \frac{|m_2-m_1|}{2} \rfloor}{|m_2-m_1|} \right\}$
(2) *if $|m_2 - m_1| = 2$, then $t_0 = 1$ and $m_2 = -m_1 = \pm 1$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.2(3), $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Proposition 2.2(6), $t_0(m_2 - m_1) = 2k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $|m_2 - m_1| = 1$, then t_0 must be an even integer, a contradiction. For (1), note that $t_0 = \dfrac{2k}{m_2 - m_1}$. For (2), we note that by (1) when $|m_2 - m_1| = 2$, t_0 is an integer, and therefore $t_0 = 1$. Then $m_2 = -m_1$ by symmetry (Proposition 2.2(2)). □

The above result immediately yields a bound on where the singularities of Υ may occur, which we use in Section 5.

Observation 2.4. *For any knot K with $g_c(K) > 0$, the singularities of Υ_K are located in $\left[\frac{1}{g_c(K)}, \frac{2g_c(K)-1}{g_c(K)}\right]$.*

Proof. From Proposition 2.2(9), we know that the largest slope change possible in Υ_K is $2g_c(K)$. The result then follows from Observation 2.3(1). □

The Upsilon invariant is particularly well-suited to detecting linear independence of knots as shown in the following.

Lemma 2.5 ([OSS14])**.** *Let $\{K_i\}_{i\in I}$, where I is a subset of $\mathbb{N}$, be a family knots such that for all $i \in I$, there exists a singularity t_i of Υ_{K_i} such that t_i is not a singularity of Υ_{K_j} for any $j < i$. Then $\{K_i\}_{i\in I}$ is linearly independent in C.*

If in addition the above $t_i = \frac{p_i}{q_i}$, where p_i and q_i are coprime, can be chosen such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \frac{\Delta\Upsilon'_{K_i}(t_i)}{2q_i} \in \{1,-1\} & \text{if } p_i \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{\Delta\Upsilon'_{K_i}(t_i)}{q_i} \in \{1,-1\} & \text{if } p_i \text{ is even} \end{array},$$

then $\{K_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a basis for a free direct summand of C.

Proof. Consider the group homomorphism

$$\lambda \colon C \to \bigoplus_I \mathbb{Z}$$

given componentwise by

$$\lambda_i(K) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Delta\Upsilon'_K(t_i)}{2q_i} & \text{if } p_i \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{\Delta\Upsilon'_K(t_i)}{q_i} & \text{if } p_i \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

where p_i and q_i are coprime positive integers such that $t_i = \frac{p_i}{q_i}$. By assumption, for any $i \in I$, $\lambda_i(K_i) \neq 0$ and $\lambda_i(K_j) = 0$ for all $j < i$ in I. Therefore, $\{\lambda(K_i)\}_{i\in I}$ is a linearly independent subset of $\bigoplus_I \mathbb{Z}$.

If in addition, $\lambda_i(K_i) \in \{1,-1\}$, then $\lambda \colon C \to \bigoplus_I \mathbb{Z}$ is surjective. Thus,

$$0 \to \ker(\lambda) \to C \to \bigoplus_I \mathbb{Z} \to 0$$

has a splitting as $\ker(\lambda) \oplus \mathfrak{I}(\phi)$ given by the (unique) section $\phi\colon \bigoplus_I \mathbb{Z} \to C$ that maps the basis $(\lambda(K_i))_{i\in I})$ to $(K_i)_{i\in I}$. □

From the above, it is straightforward to see that if the first singularities of the Υ–invariants of a family of knots are distinct, the family is linearly independent in C. Moreover, if the slope change at the first singularities is the smallest allowed by Proposition 2.2(6), the family forms a basis for a free summand of C. If the knots happen to be topologically slice, the same proof shows that the family is a basis for a free summand of $\mathcal{T}$ (compare to [OSS14, Lemma 6.4]).

3. Winding number zero satellites

By Proposition 2.2(3), for knots of low concordance genus, the number of possibilities for Υ are quite small. As a trivial example, note that if the concordance genus of a knot K is zero, then K is slice and thus Υ_K is the zero function. For concordance genus one knots, Υ is determined by the τ–invariant, i.e. any concordance genus one knot is Υ–simple, as we see in the following.

Proposition 3.1. *Let K be a knot with $g_c(K) = 1$. Then Υ_K is either the zero function (iff $\tau(K) = 0$), $\Upsilon_{T_{2,3}}$ (iff $\tau(K) = 1$), or $\Upsilon_{-T_{2,3}}$ (iff $\tau(K) = -1$).*

Recall from [OSS14] that $\Upsilon_{T_{2,3}}(t) = -1 + |1 - t|$ and thus $\Upsilon_{-T_{2,3}}(t) = 1 - |1 - t|$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. By Observations 2.3 and 2.4, we see that any slope changes much occur at $t = 1$, where the slope may change from -1 to 1 or from 1 to -1.

Since $|\tau(K)| \leq g_c(K)$ for any knot K, $\tau(K)$ is either $-1, 0$ or 1. Suppose $\tau(K) = 0$. Then by Proposition 2.2(5), the slope of Υ_K at $t = 0$ is 0. By the above paragraph, no slope changes can occur, and therefore Υ_K is the zero function. Proposition 2.2(5) gives the converse.

If $\tau(K) = 1$ then the slope of Υ_K at $t = 0$ is -1. By our earlier argument and symmetry (Proposition 2.2(2)), the slope must change from -1 to 1 at $t = 1$, and there are no other slope changes. Therefore, $\Upsilon_K(t) = -1 + |1 - t|$ which is the function $\Upsilon_{T_{2,3}}$ by [OSS14, Theorem 1.14]. Proposition 2.2(5) gives the converse. This completes the proof since $\tau(-K) = \tau(K)$, $\Upsilon_{-K} = -\Upsilon_K$, and $g_c(-K) = g_c(K)$. □

For a knot K with concordance genus two, it is easy to check by Observation 2.3, that if $\tau(K) = 0$ there is exactly one possibility for Υ (namely, the zero function), while if $\tau(K)$ is 1 or -1 there are two possibilities each, and when $\tau(K)$ is 2 or -2, there are four possibilities each, i.e. there are thirteen possible forms for Υ. In fact, using the same principle, it is straightforward to see that for any fixed concordance genus, there is a finite list of possibilities for the Υ–invariant, although the size of the list grows fast. Note that any winding number zero pattern $P \subseteq S^1 \times D^2$ bounds an orientable surface within $S^1 \times D^2$; let $g(P)$ denote the least genus of such a surface. Then the concordance genus of satellites with pattern P is bounded above by $g(P)$ and thus there is a (possibly large) finite list of possibilities for Υ. The above argument shows that the Υ–invariant can never be used to show the linear independence of an infinite family of winding number zero satellites with a fixed pattern (cf. Section 4 where we show the linear independence of infinite families of winding number one satellites with a fixed pattern).

From Proposition 3.1, we can immediately compute the Upsilon functions of all Whitehead doubles.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $* \in \{+, -\}$, and let $\mathrm{Wh}^*_k(K)$ denotes the $*$–clasped k–twisted Whitehead double of the knot K. Then,*

$$\Upsilon_{\mathrm{Wh}^+_k(K)}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \geq 2\tau(K) \\ -1 + |1 - t| & \text{if } k < 2\tau(K) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Upsilon_{\mathrm{Wh}_k^-(K)}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \leq 2\tau(K) \\ 1 - |1-t| & \text{if } k > 2\tau(K) \end{cases}$$

Proof. Note that the Whitehead doubling pattern $\mathrm{Wh} \subseteq S^1 \times D^2$ bounds a genus one surface within $S^1 \times D^2$. Thus, $g(\mathrm{Wh}_k^*(K)) = 1$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and as a result, $g_c(\mathrm{Wh}_k^*(K)) \leq 1$. The result then follows from Proposition 3.1 and [Hed07, Theorem 1.5], which states that if $k \geq 2\tau(K)$, then $\tau(\mathrm{Wh}_k^+(K)) = 0$ and if $k < 2\tau(K)$, $\tau(\mathrm{Wh}_k^+(K)) = 1$. For the second statement we use the fact that $\mathrm{Wh}_k^-(K) = m\mathrm{Wh}_{-k}^+(mK)$ and $\tau(mK) = -\tau(K)$. □

The above shows that Υ is no better than τ at distinguishing between Whitehead doubles. We also obtain the following straightforward corollary since the twist knots are Whitehead doubles of the unknot.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $* \in \{+, -\}$ and let T_k^* denote the $*$–clasped k–twist knot, i.e. $T_k^* = \mathrm{Wh}_k^*(U)$ where U is the unknot. Then,*

$$\Upsilon_{T_k^+}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \geq 0 \\ -1 + |1-t| & \text{if } k < 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Upsilon_{T_k^-}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \leq 0 \\ 1 - |1-t| & \text{if } k > 0 \end{cases}.$$

We can also address the generalized Whitehead doubles $D_{J,s}(K,k)$, studied by A. Levine in [Lev12]. Levine showed that $\tau(D_{J,s}(K,k)) = 1$ if and only if $s < 2\tau(J)$ and $k < 2\tau(K)$, $\tau(D_{J,s}(K,k)) = -1$ if and only if $s > 2\tau(J)$ and $k > 2\tau(K)$, and $\tau(D_{J,s}(K,k)) = 0$ otherwise. Moreover, $D_{J,s}(K,0)$ is topologically slice. It was also shown that $g(D_{J,s}(K,k) = 1$ by [Lev12, Figure 2b]. By Proposition 3.1 we then have the following result.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $D_{J,s}(K,k)$ denote the generalized Whitehead doubles from* [Lev12]. *Then*

$$\Upsilon_{D_{J,s}(K,k)}(t) = \begin{cases} -1 + |1-t| & \text{if } s < 2\tau(J) \text{ and } k < 2\tau(K) \\ 1 - |1-t| & \text{if } s > 2\tau(J) \text{ and } k > 2\tau(K) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We end this section with a corollary about the smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number.

Corollary 3.5. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) > 0$. Then $k \leq \gamma_4(\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K))$ for any positive integer k.*

Thus, the smooth 4–dimensional crosscap number of topologically slice knots can be arbitrarily large.

Proof. By Proposition 3.2, we see that $\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)$ is Υ–simple with $\tau(\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = 1$. Thus,

$$\tau(\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = k.$$

Moreover, $\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)$ is Υ–simple as a connected-sum of Υ–simple knots by Proposition 2.2(1). By Proposition 2.2(10), since $\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)$ is topologically slice, $|\upsilon(\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K))| \leq \gamma_4(\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K))$. Since $\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)$ is Υ–simple, $\upsilon(\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = -\tau(\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K))$. Thus, $k \leq \gamma_4(\#_k \mathrm{Wh}^+(K))$. □

Note that by Proposition 3.1, we could have used any topologically slice knot with $\tau(K) = g_c(K) = 1$ in the above proof.

4. Winding number 1 satellites

Proposition 4.1. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) > 0$ such that the first singularity of Υ_K occurs at $t_0 < 1$. Let α be the slope of Υ_K at $t_0 + \epsilon$. Let P be a pattern which can be changed to the trivial pattern by changing r positive crossings to negative crossings and $\tau(P(K)) = \tau(K) + r$. Assume that*

(1) $r \neq 0$,
(2) $\alpha \neq n\tau(K)$ *for any positive integer n,*
(3) $t_0 \cdot r$ *is not an even integer, and*
(4) $(r, \tau(K)) = 1$.

Then $\{K, P(K)\}$ is linearly independent.

Several families of patterns and knots satisfying the requirements of the above proposition are given in [Ray15]. In particular, the Mazur pattern is known to satisfy the conditions of the proposition for any knot K with $\tau(K) > 0$ by [Lev14] and we have the following corollary. Recall that the Mazur pattern is denoted by M.

Corollary 4.2. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) > 0$, such that the first singularity of Υ_K occurs at $t_0 < 1$. Let α be the slope of Υ_K at $t_0 + \epsilon$. Assume that $\alpha \neq n\tau(K)$ for any positive integer n. Then $\{K, M(K)\}$ is linearly independent.*

Proof. By [Lev14], we know that $\tau(M(K)) = \tau(K) + 1$. It is easy to see that the pattern M is changed to the trivial pattern by changing a single positive crossing (at the clasp) to a negative crossing. Thus we can apply Proposition 4.1 with $r = 1$. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1. By Lemma 2.5 we only have to consider the case where the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{P(K)}$ also occurs at t_0. Since P can be changed to the trivial pattern by r crossing changes, we can use the same sequence of crossing changes to transform $P(K)$ to K. By Proposition 2.2(7), we have

$$|\Upsilon_K(t) - \Upsilon_{P(K)}(t)| \leq r \cdot t$$

for any $t \leq 1$. Therefore, we see that the slope of $\Upsilon_{P(K)}$ at $t_0 + \epsilon$ must be $\alpha - r + \ell$ for some non-negative $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ (recall that the slopes of any Υ function are always integers by Proposition 2.2(3)).

Assume towards a contradiction that there exist non-zero integers p, q for which $pP(K)$ is concordant to qK. This yields

$$\frac{-\tau(K)}{-\tau(P(K))} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - r + \ell},$$

which we rewrite as $\alpha = \tau(K) \cdot \left(\frac{\ell}{r} - 1\right)$ using the fact that $\tau(P(K)) = \tau(K) + r$. Note that $\alpha = 0$ if and only if $\ell = r$, since $\tau(K) > 0$. We will address the situation of $\ell = r$ momentarily. Suppose that $\alpha \neq 0$. Then, since α and $\tau(K)$ are both integers with $(r, \tau(K)) = 1$, we must have that $r|\ell$, and moreover, by hypothesis, $\left(\frac{\ell}{r} - 1\right) \leq 0$ and thus, $\ell \leq r$. This implies that either $\ell = 0$ or $\ell = r$.

If $\ell = 0$, then $\alpha = -\tau(K)$ which contradicts the fact that t_0 is a singularity of Υ_K.

If $\ell = r$, we saw that $\alpha = 0$. By Proposition 2.2(6), we know that $t_0 \cdot (\alpha - \tau(K)) = -t_0 \cdot \tau(K)$ and $t_0 \cdot (\alpha - r + \ell - \tau(P(K))) = -t_0 \cdot (\tau(K) + r)$ must both be even integers, which is impossible unless $t_0 \cdot r$ is an even integer. □

Proposition 4.1 can be applied to several families of knots, as follows.

Corollary 4.3. *Let K denote the torus knot $T_{p,q}$, where $3 \leq p < q$. Then the set $\{K, M^i(K)\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{C}$ for any $i \geq 1$ not divisible by p with $(i, \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}) = 1$.*

Proof. For any $i \geq 1$, since M can be changed to the trivial pattern by changing a single positive crossing, $M^i(K)$ can be changed to K by changing i positive crossings to negative crossings. Thus, $r = i$.

The first singularity of Υ_K occurs at $t_0 = 2/p < 1$; see e.g. [Wan15]. We know that $\tau(K)$ is positive by [OS03]. Let α denote the slope of Υ_K at $t_0 + \epsilon$. Since Υ_K for a torus knot is convex by [OSS14, Theorem 1.15], we must have that $|\alpha| < \tau(K)$, and therefore, $\alpha \neq n\tau(K)$ for any positive integer n. Note that $\frac{2}{p} \cdot i$ is not an even integer exactly when i is not divisible by p. Lastly, we know that $\tau(K) = \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}$ from [OS03]. Thus, by hypothesis, $(r, \tau(K)) = 1$. □

By applying the above corollaries, we see that $\{T_{p,q}, M(T_{p,q})\}$ is linearly independent for all p, q with $3 \leq p < q$. As a further example, we see that $\{T_{3,4}, M^i(T_{3,4})\}$ is linearly independent whenever i is not a multiple of 3.

We may also apply Proposition 4.1 to families of topologically slice knots. Let $(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3}))_{p,q}$ denote the (p, q)–cable of the untwisted positive Whitehead double of the trefoil $T_{2,3}$. For $n \geq 0$, let

$$K_n \coloneqq (\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3}))_{n+2,2n+3}\# - T_{n+2,2n+3}.$$

In [OSS14], Ozsváth, Stipsicz, Szabó showed that these knots generate a free direct summand of $\mathcal{T}$. Here it is easy to see that each K_n is topologically slice, since $\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3})$ is topologically slice and therefore, $(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3}))_{n+2,2n+3}$ is topologically concordant to $T_{n+2,2n+3}$. Consequently, $M^r(K_n)$ is topologically slice for all $n \geq 0$ and $r \geq 1$.

Corollary 4.4. *For each $n \geq 0$, $\{K_n, M(K_n)\}$ is linearly independent in C.*

We give the proof after a lemma, collecting several facts from [Lev14, OSS14].

Lemma 4.5. *For the knots K_n, $n \geq 0$ defined above, let t_n denote the first singularity of Υ_{K_n}, and α_n the slope of Υ_{K_n} at $t_n + \epsilon$. Then,*

(1) $\tau(K_n) = n + 2$
(2) $\tau(M^r(K_n)) = \tau(K_n) + r$ *for any* $r \geq 0$.
(3) $t_n = \frac{2}{2n+3}$
(4) $\alpha_n = n + 1$

Proof. By the properties of τ given in [OS03],

$$\tau(K_n) = \tau((\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3}))_{n+2,2n+3}) - \tau(T_{n+2,2n+3})$$

We also know from [OS03] that $\tau(T_{n+2,2n+3}) = \frac{(n+2-1)(2n+3-1)}{2} = \frac{(n+1)(2n+2)}{2} = (n+1)^2$. We know from [Hed07, Theorem 1.4] that $\tau(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3})) = 1$, since $\tau(T_{2,3}) > 0$. Note that

$$\tau(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3})) = g(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3})) = 1$$

and so by [Hom14, Proposition 3.6], we see that $\varepsilon(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3})) = \mathrm{sgn}(\tau(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3})) = 1$. Then by [Hom14, Theorem 1],

$$\tau((\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3}))_{n+2,2n+3}) = (n+2) \cdot \tau(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3})) + \frac{(n+2-1)(2n+3-1)}{2} = (n+2) + (n+1)^2$$

As a result, $\tau(K_n) = n + 2 > 0$.

By [Lev14, Corollary 1.6], part (2) follows since $\tau(K_n) > 0$. For part (3), we know from [OSS14, Lemma 8.7] that the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3}))_{n+2,2n+3}}$ occurs at $\frac{2}{2n+3}$ and [OSS14, Lemma 8.12] shows that $\Upsilon_{T_{n+2,2n+3}}$ has no singularities in $(0, \frac{2}{n+2})$. Since $\frac{2}{2n+3} < \frac{2}{n+2}$ for any $n \geq 0$, we see that the first singularity of Υ_{K_n} occurs at $\frac{2}{2n+3}$.

From [OSS14,], we know that the slope of $\Upsilon_{(\mathrm{Wh}^+(T_{2,3}))_{n+2,2n+3}}$ at $\frac{2}{2n+3} + \epsilon$ is $-(n^2 + n)$, and since the slope of $\Upsilon_{T_{n+2,2n+3}}$ at $\frac{2}{2n+3} + \epsilon$ is $-(n+1)^2$, we see that $\alpha_n = n + 1$. □

Proof of Corollary 4.4. From Lemma 4.5, using our previous notation, we see that $\tau(K_n) > 0$, $t_n < 1$, and α_n is not an positive integer multiple of $\tau(K_n)$, for each $n \geq 0$. Thus we can apply Corollary 4.2. □

We may also use the Υ–invariant to detect whether winding number one satellite operators preserve linear independence of families of knots.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $\{J_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of knots with arbitrarily small first singularity of Υ_{J_n}; that is, if the first singularity of Υ_{J_n} occurs at t_n, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = 0$. Furthermore, assume that the change of slope at t_n is positive; e.g. if $\tau(J_n) = g_4(J_n)$. Let P be a pattern which can be changed to the trivial pattern by changing r positive crossings to negative crossings, and $\tau(P(J_n)) = \tau(J_n) + r$ for any n. Then there is a subsequence of knots $\{J_{n_l}\}_{n_l=0}^{\infty}$ such that $\{P(J_{n_l})\}_{n_l=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent in C.*

Proof. First observe that, for any $n \geq 0$, $\Upsilon_{P(J_n)}$ has its first singularity in $(0, t_n]$, as follows. Assume towards a contradiction that $\Upsilon_{P(J_n)}$ has no singularity in $(0, t_n]$. This means that there exists a $\bar{t}$ such that for all t with $1 > \bar{t} \geq t > t_n$ we have

$$\Upsilon_{P(J_n)}(t) = -\tau(P(J_n)) \cdot t = -\tau(J_n) \cdot t - r \cdot t.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\Upsilon_{J_n}(t) - \Upsilon_{P(J_n)}(t) > -t \cdot \tau(J_n) - (-\tau(J_n) \cdot t - r \cdot t) = r \cdot t$$

for $t > t_n$ close to t_n, where the fact that the slope change at t_n is positive is used for the first inequality.

However, note that since P can be changed to the trivial pattern by changing r positive crossings to negative crossings, from Proposition 2.2(8), we know that $|\Upsilon_{J_n}(t) - \Upsilon_{P(J_n)}(t)| \leq r \cdot t$, contradicting the previous statement.

Set $J_{n_0} = J_0$ and choose J_{n_l} inductively: assume $J_{n_0}, J_{n_1} \cdots J_{n_l}$ have been chosen such that the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{P(J_{n_i})}$ and $\Upsilon_{P(J_{n_j})}$ are different for $i \neq j$. We set $J_{n_{l+1}} = J_n$ such that t_n is strictly smaller than all of the first singularities of $\Upsilon_{P(J_{n_i})}$ for $i \leq l$. By Lemma 2.5, this yields a sequence of knots J_{n_l} as desired. □

There are several infinite families of knots known to be linearly independent in C, e.g. for the positive torus knots this is established using Levine–Tristram signatures in [Lit79, Theorem 1]. Since winding number one patterns P with $P(U)$ slice preserve signatures, we can also use the Levine–Tristram signatures to show that the image of the positive torus knots under the Mazur pattern are linearly independent in C. The advantage of the Υ–invariant over the classical signature function is that it can detect linear independence of families of topologically slice knots, for whom the signature function (averaged at the roots of the Alexander polynomial) vanishes. We show an example below.

Corollary 4.7. *For the sequence of linearly independent topologically slice knots $\{K_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ from Lemma 4.5 and any positive integer r, there is a subsequence $\{K_{n_l}\}_{n_l=0}^{\infty}$ such that the set $\{M^r(K_{n_l})\}_{n_l=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent in C. In particular, $\{M^r(K_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ generates an infinite rank subgroup of C for all non-negative integers r.*

Proof. Using the notation from Lemma 4.5, we saw that $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = 0$, the change of slope at t_n is positive, and $\tau(M^r(K_n)) = \tau(K_n) + r$ for any $n \geq 0$ and $r \geq 1$. Since the iterated pattern M^r can be changed to the trivial pattern by changing r positive crossings to negative crossings, we can apply Proposition 4.6. □



FIGURE 3. The pattern Q.

We note that there are other methods for showing the linear independence of topologically slice knots; the first example of a family of linearly independent topologically slice knots was given by Endo in [End95].

We have now finished the proof of Theorem 4.8, which we restate below.

Theorem 4.8. *There exists an infinite family of topologically slice knots $\{K_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all non-negative integers r, $\{M^r(K_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ generates a subgroup of C of infinite rank.*

By combining Theorem 4.8 and Corollary 4.4, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.9. *There is an infinite family of pairs of knots $\{(K_i, J_i)\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ such that*

1. *$\{K_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent in C.*
2. *$\{J_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent in C.*
3. *For each i, K_i and J_i are satellites with the same companion, under winding number one patterns M and Q such that $M(U)$ and $Q(U)$ are slice.*
4. *$\{K_i, J_i\}$ is linearly independent in C for each i, even modulo changing the orientation of the knots,*
5. *each K_i and J_i can be chosen to be topologically slice,*
6. *the 0–surgery manifolds on K_i and J_i are homeomorphic, for each i.*

Proof. In [Yas14, Corollaries 4.12 and 4.13], Yasui showed that for any topologically slice knot K with $\tau(K) > 0$, the pair of knots $(M(K), Q(K))$, where Q is the pattern shown in Figure 3, have the same 0–surgery but are not concordant for any orientation. By Corollary 4.7, there is an infinite linearly independent family of topologically slice knots $\{M(K_{n_l})\}_{n_l=0}^{\infty}$, where $\tau(K_{n_l}) > 0$. Let K_i denote the knots $M(K_{n_l})$ from Corollary 4.7, and J_i denote the corresponding $Q(K_{n_l})$.

Note that for any knot K, $Q(K)$ is concordant to K via cutting a single band. Since each K_{n_l} is topologically slice, so is $Q(K_{n_l})$. Moreover, each pair $\{M(K_{n_l}), Q(K_{n_l})\}$ is linearly independent since $\{M(K_{n_l}), K_{n_l}\}$ is linearly independent by Corollary 4.4. Changing the orientation of the knots does not affect this, since we know from Proposition 2.2(1) that the Υ–invariant is invariant under reverses. □

5. CABLE KNOTS

In [Che16], Chen showed that for any knot K, and relatively prime integers p, q with $p > 0$,

$$\Upsilon_K(pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t \le \Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) \le \Upsilon_K(pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}t, \tag{5.1}$$

when $0 \le t \le \frac{2}{p}$.

This is reminiscent of the behavior of the τ–invariant under cabling, which we recall below.

Proposition 5.1 ([Hom14, Theorem 1])**.** *Let K be a knot and $p > 0$. Let ε denote the concordance invariant defined in* [Hom14].

(1) *If* $\varepsilon(K) = 1$, *then* $\tau(K_{p,q}) = p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}$.
(2) *If* $\varepsilon(K) = -1$, *then* $\tau(K_{p,q}) = p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}$.
(3) *If* $\varepsilon(K) = 0$, *then* $\tau(K) = 0$ *and* $\tau(K_{p,q}) = \tau(T_{p,q}) = \begin{cases} \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2} & \text{if } q < 0, \\ \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2} & \text{if } q > 0. \end{cases}$

Recall that we have the following formula for signatures of cable knots.

Proposition 5.2 ([Lit79, Theorem 2])**.** *Let K be a knot and ω be a root of unity. Then*

$$\sigma_\omega(K_{p,q}) = \sigma_{\omega^p}(K) + \sigma_\omega(T_{p,q}).$$

This immediately yields the following, certainly well-known, result for cables of topologically slice knots.

Corollary 5.3. *Let p, q be coprime integers with $|p|, |q| \geq 2$. If a topologically slice knot K represents a non-torsion element in C, then $\{K, K_{p,q}\}$ are linearly independent.*

Proof. The signature $\sigma = \sigma_{-1}$ is non-zero on the non-trivial torus knots $T_{p,q}$. If we have $aK + bK_{p,q} = 0$ in C, then applying Proposition 5.2 for $\omega = -1$ yields $b = 0$. This completes the proof since K is assumed to be non-torsion in C. □

While our results below cover all cables, Corollary 5.3 explains why the case $|q| = 1$ is of particular interest.

For any K with $\tau(K) \neq 0$, Chen's inequality allows us to determine an interval for the first singularity as we see below.

Proposition 5.4. *For any knot K with $\tau(K) \neq 0$, the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ is in $\left(0, \frac{2}{p}\right]$.*

For certain knots, we can do better:

Proposition 5.5. *For any knot K with $\tau(K) \neq 0$ such that the first singularity of Υ_K is located in $\left(\frac{2p(|\tau(K)|-1)+2}{2p|\tau(K)|-(p-1)}, 1\right]$, the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ is in $\left(0, \frac{2|\tau(K)|}{2p|\tau(K)|-(p-1)}\right]$.*

Since for an Υ–simple knot the first singularity of Υ is at 1, we get the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 5.6. *Let K be an Υ–simple knot with $\tau(K) \neq 0$. Then $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ has a singularity in $\left(0, \frac{2|\tau(K)|}{2p|\tau(K)|-(p-1)}\right]$, for any $p \geq 2$.*

In particular, if $\tau(K) = 1$, the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ for an Υ–simple K, is in $\left(0, \frac{2}{p+1}\right]$. In general, $\frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} < \frac{2}{p}$, so in particular, $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ has a singularity in $\left(0, \frac{2}{p}\right)$, for any $p \geq 2$, whenever $\tau(K) \neq 0$ and K is Υ–simple (compare to Proposition 5.4, where we get the bound $\left(0, \frac{2}{p}\right]$).

Proof of Proposition 5.4. First we consider the case when $\tau(K) > 0$. Suppose that $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ does not have a singularity in $\left(0, \frac{2}{p}\right]$, i.e. $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\tau(K_{p,q}) \cdot t$ on $\left(0, \frac{2}{p}\right]$.

Since $\tau(K) > 0$, $\varepsilon(K) \neq 0$. If $\varepsilon(K) = 1$, we know that $\tau(K_{p,q}) = p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}$ from Proposition 5.1, and thus

$$\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\left(p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}\right) \cdot t$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq \frac{2}{p}$. By Chen's inequality (5.1), for $0 \leq t \leq \frac{2}{p}$,

$$\Upsilon_K(pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t \leq -\left(p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}\right) \cdot t.$$

By Proposition 2.2(2) and (4), we know that $\Upsilon_K(2) = 0$, and thus, at $t = \frac{2}{p}$, we see

$$\frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{p} \geq 2\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{p}$$

and thus,

$$(p-1) \geq p\tau(K)$$

which is a contradiction, since $\tau(K) > 0$.

If $\varepsilon(K) = -1$, we know that $\tau(K_{p,q}) = p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}$ from Proposition 5.1, and thus

$$\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\left(p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}\right) \cdot t$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq \frac{2}{p}$. By Chen's inequality (5.1), for $0 \leq t \leq \frac{2}{p}$,

$$\Upsilon_K(pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t \leq -\left(p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}\right) \cdot t.$$

Thus at $t = \frac{2}{p}$,

$$\frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{p} \geq 2\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{p}$$

and thus,

$$0 \geq 2\tau(K)$$

which is a contradiction, since $\tau(K) > 0$.

For the case when $\tau(K) < 0$, notice that $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\Upsilon_{-(K_{p,q})}(t) = -\Upsilon_{(-K)_{p,-q}}(t)$. Since $\tau(-K) > 0$, the result follows from the previous case. □

Proof of Proposition 5.5. The structure of this proof is quite similar to the proof for Proposition 5.4.

First we consider the case when $\tau(K) > 0$. By hypothesis, we know that the first singularity of Υ_K occurs in $\left(\frac{2p(\tau(K)-1)+2}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)}, 1\right]$, i.e. there is no singularity in $\left(0, \frac{2p(\tau(K)-1)+2}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)}\right]$. By Proposition 2.2(2), there is no singularity in $\left[2 - \frac{2p(\tau(K)-1)+2}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)}, 2\right) = \left[\frac{2p\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)}, 2\right)$. (Note that $\frac{2p\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} > 1$ since $p \geq 2$). Thus, by Proposition 2.2(2) and (5), for $t \in \left[\frac{2p\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)}, 2\right]$,

$$\Upsilon_K(t) = \tau(K)(-2+t). \tag{5.2}$$

Suppose that $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ does not have a singularity in $\left(0, \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)}\right]$, i.e. $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\tau(K_{p,q}) \cdot t$ on $\left(0, \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon\right)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Since $\tau(K) > 0$, $\varepsilon(K) \neq 0$. If $\varepsilon(K) = 1$, we know that $\tau(K_{p,q}) = p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}$ from Proposition 5.1, and thus

$$\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\left(p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}\right) \cdot t$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon$. By Chen's inequality (5.1), for $\frac{1}{p} \leq t \leq \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon \leq \frac{2}{p}$,

$$\Upsilon_K(pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t \leq -\left(p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}\right) \cdot t.$$

For $t = \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon$, using (5.2), we see that

$$\tau(K)(-2+pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t \leq -p\tau(K) \cdot t - \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}t$$

and thus,

$$t \leq \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K) - (p-1)}$$

which is a contradiction, since $t = \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

If $\varepsilon(K) = -1$, we know that $\tau(K_{p,q}) = p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}$ from Proposition 5.1, and thus

$$\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\left(p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}\right) \cdot t$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon$. By Chen's inequality (5.1), for $\frac{1}{p} \leq t \leq \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon \leq \frac{2}{p}$,

$$\Upsilon_K(pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t \leq -\left(p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}\right) \cdot t.$$

For $t = \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon$, using (5.2), we see that

$$\tau(K)(-2 + pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t \leq -p\tau(K) \cdot t - \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t$$

and thus,

$$t \leq \frac{1}{p}$$

which is a contradiction, since $t = \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} + \epsilon > \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)} > \frac{1}{p}$, since $\epsilon > 0$ and $p \geq 2$.

For the case when $\tau(K) < 0$, notice that $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\Upsilon_{-(K_{p,q})}(t) = -\Upsilon_{(-K)_{p,-q}}(t)$. Since $\tau(-K) > 0$, the result follows from the previous case. □

For certain families of Υ–simple knots, we can further narrow down the location of the first singularity for $(p, 1)$ cables, compared to Corollary 5.6, as we see below.

Proposition 5.7. *Suppose K is Υ–simple with $g_4(K) = \tau(K) > 0$. Then $\Upsilon_{K_{p,1}}$ has its first singularity in $\left[\frac{1}{p}, \frac{2\tau(K)}{2p\tau(K)-(p-1)}\right]$, for any $p \geq 2$.*

Proof. By Corollary 5.6 it will be enough to show that $\Upsilon_{K_{p,1}}$ does not have a singularity in $\left(0, \frac{1}{p}\right)$. Note that by [Hom14, Corollary 4] we have $\varepsilon(K) = 1$, and hence $\tau(K_{p,1}) = p\tau(K)$ from Proposition 5.1. For any surface Σ in B^4 bounded by K, we can use p parallel copies band-summed together to get a surface with genus $pg(\Sigma)$ bounded by $K_{p,1}$. Thus, $g_4(K_{p,1}) \leq pg_4(K)$. Thus, since $p\tau(K) = \tau(K_{p,1}) \leq g_4(K_{p,1}) \leq pg_4(K)$, we can conclude that $g_4(K_{p,1}) = \tau(K_{p,1}) = p\tau(K)$.

By Chen's inequality (5.1) for $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{p}$,

$$\Upsilon_{K_{p,1}}(t) \leq \Upsilon_K(pt) = -p\tau(K) \cdot t.$$

On the other hand by Proposition 2.2(8),

$$-g_4(K_{p,1}) \cdot t = -p\tau(K) \cdot t \leq \Upsilon_{K_{p,1}}(t).$$

Thus, for $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{p}$, $\Upsilon_{K_{p,1}}(t) = -p\tau(K) \cdot t$ which concludes the proof. □

Using the above results, we obtain several corollaries about the linear independence of a knot from its cables. We list several below.

Corollary 5.8. *If K is an Υ–simple knot with $\tau(K) \neq 0$, then $\{K, K_{p,q}\}$ is linearly independent in C for any p, q with $p \geq 2$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 5.6, since $\frac{2|\tau(K)|}{2p|\tau(K)|-(p-1)} < 1$ for any $p \geq 2$ and $\tau(K) \neq 0$. Recall that the only singularity of Υ_K occurs at $t = 1$ since K is Υ–simple. □

Remark 5.9. Weaker versions of Corollary 5.8 can be obtained using simple geometric arguments and Proposition 2.2(10). This calculation can be seen in the first version of this paper on the Arxiv, which was written before Chen's inequality was announced.

Corollary 5.10. *If K is a knot with $\tau(K) \neq 0$ such that, for some $p \geq 2$, the first singularity of Υ_K occurs in $\left(\frac{2p(|\tau(K)|-1)+2}{2p|\tau(K)|-(p-1)}, 1\right]$, then K and $K_{p',q}$ are linearly independent in C for any $p' \geq p$.*

Proof. Note that for $p' \geq p$, $\frac{2p'(|\tau(K)|-1)+2}{2p'|\tau(K)|-(p'-1)} \leq \frac{2p(|\tau(K)|-1)+2}{2p|\tau(K)|-(p-1)}$. Thus, if the first singularity of Υ_K occurs in $\left(\frac{2p(|\tau(K)|-1)+2}{2p|\tau(K)|-(p-1)}, 1\right]$ for some $p \geq 2$, the first singularity occurs in $\left(\frac{2p'(|\tau(K)|-1)+2}{2p'|\tau(K)|-(p'-1)}, 1\right]$ for any $p' \geq p$. By Proposition 5.5, then the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p',q}}$ occurs in $\left(0, \frac{2|\tau(K)|}{2p'|\tau(K)|-(p'-1)}\right]$. The result then follows from Lemma 2.5, since $\frac{2|\tau(K)|}{2p'|\tau(K)|-(p'-1)} < \frac{2p'(|\tau(K)|-1)+2}{2p'|\tau(K)|-(p'-1)}$ since $p' \geq 2$. □

Corollary 5.11. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) \neq 0$ such that the first singularity of Υ_K occurs at t_0. If N is the smallest integer such that $N > 2/t_0$, then K and $K_{p,q}$ are linearly independent in C for any $p \geq N$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.4, the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ occurs in $\left(0, \frac{2}{p}\right]$. Since $p \geq N > \frac{2}{t_0}$, we see that $\frac{2}{p} < t_0$, and thus we can use Lemma 2.5. □

Corollary 5.12. *If K is a knot with $\tau(K) \neq 0$ then for any $p > 2g_c(K)$, K and $K_{p,q}$ are linearly independent in C.*

Proof. From Observation 2.4 we know that the singularities of Υ_K must occur in $\left[\frac{1}{g_c(K)}, \frac{2g_c(K)-1}{g_c(K)}\right]$. By Proposition 5.4, the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ occurs in $\left(0, \frac{2}{p}\right]$. Since $p > 2g_c(K)$, $\frac{2}{p} < \frac{1}{g_c(K)}$, and we can apply Lemma 2.5. □

Corollary 5.13. *If K is a knot with $\tau(K) \neq 0$, then there exist a sequence (p_i, q_i) such that $\{K_{(p_i,q_i)}\}$ is linearly independent in C. (q_i can be chosen to be ± 1.)*

Proof. This follows by repeatedly applying Corollary 5.11. That is, if t_0 is the first singularity of Υ_K, choose $p_1 \geq \frac{2}{t_0}$, then iteratively choose $p_{i+1} \geq \frac{2}{t_i}$ where t_i is the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p_i,q_i}}$. □

Corollary 5.14. *Suppose that K has $\tau(K) = g_c(K) > 0$ then we can choose any integer n such that $n > 2\tau(K)$. If we let $p_i = n^i$ then $\{K_{p_i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent in C for $i \geq 0$.*

Proof. Using an argument similar to that in the proof of Proposition 5.7, It can be easily verified that $g_c(K_{p_i,1}) \leq p_i \cdot g_c(K) = p_i \cdot \tau(K)$. Further, by using Proposition 5.1 $\tau(K_{p_i,1}) = p_i \cdot \tau(K) \leq g_c(K_{p_i,1}) \leq p_i \cdot \tau(K)$ since $\varepsilon(K) = 1$ by [Hom14, Corollary 4], and thus, $g_c(K_{p_i,1}) = \tau(K_{p_i,1}) = p_i \cdot \tau(K)$. By Observation 2.4, the singularities of Υ_K occur in $\left[\frac{1}{\tau(K)}, \frac{2\tau(K)-1}{\tau(K)}\right]$, and by Observation 2.4 and Proposition 5.4 the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p_i,1}}$ occurs in $\left[\frac{1}{p_i \cdot \tau(K)}, \frac{2}{p_i}\right]$. Hence, $\Upsilon_{K_{p_i,1}}$ have distinct singularities since $\frac{2}{p_{i+1}} < \frac{1}{p_i \cdot \tau(K)}$ for all $i \geq 0$. We can then apply Lemma 2.5. □

For Υ–simple knots, we can do better.

Corollary 5.15. *For any Υ–simple knot K with $g_4(K) = \tau(K) > 0$, the sequence $\{K_{2^i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent.*

Proof. From Proposition 5.7, we know that the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{2^i,1}}$ occurs within $\left[\frac{1}{2^i}, \frac{2\tau(K)}{2^{i+1}\tau(K)-(2^i-1)}\right]$, and thus are all distinct since $\frac{2\tau(K)}{2^{i+2}\tau(K)-(2^{i+1}-1)} < \frac{1}{2^i}$ for any $i \geq 1$. We can then apply Lemma 2.5. □

For any knot K, let $K_{p_1,1;p_2,1;p_3,1;\dots;p_n,1}$ denote the iterated cable $(\dots((K_{p_1,1})_{p_2,1})\dots)_{p_n,1}$.

Corollary 5.16. *For any knot K with $\tau(K) \neq 0$, we can find a sequence $\{p_i\}$ such that the family of iterated cables $\{K, K_{p_1,1}, K_{p_1,1;p_2,1}, K_{p_1,1;p_2,1;p_3,1}, \dots\}$ is linearly independent in C.*

Proof. Let t_0 be the first singularity of Υ_K, and t_i the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p_1,1;p_2,1;\dots;p_i,1}}$. Choose p_i such that $\frac{2}{p_i} < t_{i-1}$. Now the result follows from Proposition 5.4, where we use the fact that the τ invariant of the cable knots stays non-zero by Proposition 5.1. □

As mentioned before, even for topologically slice knots, when $|q| \geq 2$, the above results may be seen using Levine–Tristram signatures. However, the above results may be applied to the $|q| = 1$ case as well. For example we have the following version of Corollary 5.8.

Corollary 5.17. *Let K be an Υ–simple topologically slice knot with $\tau(K) \neq 0$. Then $\{K, K_{p,\pm1}\}$ is linearly independent for any $p \geq 2$.*

We saw in the introduction that there are several families of Υ–simple knots, including topologically slice knots, such as Whitehead doubles (Proposition 3.2) and generalized Whitehead doubles (Corollary 3.4) (and moreover, Υ–simple topologically slice knots are closed under connected-sum). For the specific case of Whitehead doubles, we have the following.

Corollary 5.18. *Let $\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)$ denote the positive clasped untwisted Whitehead double of a knot K with $\tau(K) > 0$. Then $\{\mathrm{Wh}^+(K), \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)_{p,\pm1}\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{T}$ for any $p \geq 2$.*

Corollary 5.19. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) > 0$. Then the sequence $\{\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)_{2^i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. We saw in Proposition 3.2 that $\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)$ is Υ–simple with $\tau(\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = g_4(\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = 1$. We can then apply Corollary 5.15. □

Similarly, we have the following version of Corollary 5.16.

Corollary 5.20. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) > 0$. Then we can find a sequence $\{p_i\}$ such that the family of iterated cables $\{\mathrm{Wh}^+(K), \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)_{p_1,1}, \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)_{p_1,1;p_2,1}, \mathrm{Wh}^+(K)_{p_1,1;p_2,1;p_3,1}, \dots\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{T}$.*

In addition to showing linear independence of families of cables, we can also sometimes conclude that the families form a basis for a free summand of C or $\mathcal{T}$ as we see below.

Theorem 5.21. *For any Υ–simple knot K with $\tau(K) = g_4(K) = g_c(K) = 1$, the knots $\{K_{2^i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ form a basis for an infinite summand of C.*

Proof. Corollary 5.15 proves that the family is linearly independent by showing that the singularities of the Υ functions occur at different locations. Here we will show that the slope change must be the minimum allowed slope change at the first singularity, allowing us to use the second part of Lemma 2.5.

Since K is Υ–simple with $\tau(K) = 1$, we know that the first singularity of Υ_K occurs at 1 where the slope change is 2, the lowest possible. From Proposition 5.7, we know that the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{2^i,1}}$, for $i \geq 0$, occurs in the interval $\left[\frac{1}{2^i}, \frac{2}{2^i+1}\right]$. We also know from the proof of Corollary 5.14 that $g_c(K_{2^i,1}) = 2^i$, and thus the maximum possible slope change in $\Upsilon_{K_{2^i,1}}$ is 2^{i+1}. We will determine the magnitude of the slope change at the first singularity, call it Δm_i, of $\Upsilon_{K_{2^i,1}}$. We know that $\Delta m_i \leq 2g_c(K_{2^i,1}) = 2^{i+1}$. We know that the singularities occur at points of the form $\frac{2k}{\Delta m_i}$ from Observation 2.3. For the first singularity, we have $\frac{1}{2^i} \leq \frac{2k}{\Delta m_i} \leq \frac{2}{2^i+1}$. Thus, $k2^i < k(2^i+1) \leq \Delta m_i \leq$

2^{i+1} where $k > 0$. This implies that $k = 1$ and thus $2^i + 1 \leq \Delta m_i \leq 2^{i+1}$. This means that the first singularity occurs at $\frac{2}{2^i+\ell}$ for some ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq 2^i$, where the slope change must be exactly $2^i + \ell$ (notice that the next higher possible slope change is $2(2^i + \ell)$ but this is not allowed since the slope changes are bounded above by $2^{i+1} = 2g_c(K_{2^i,1})$). Thus the slope change is the lowest possible! We can now use Lemma 2.5 to conclude that $\{K_{2^i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is a basis for an infinite summand of C. □

The above theorem can be applied to many Υ–simple knots.

Corollary 5.22. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) > 0$. Then $\{\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)_{2^i,1}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is a basis for an infinite rank summand of $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. This is immediate, since $\tau(\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = g_4(\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = g_c(\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = g_3(\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)) = 1$, and we see from Proposition 3.2 that $\mathrm{Wh}^+(K)$ is Υ–simple. □

Notice that all the knots in the above corollary have trivial Alexander polynomial. We could also have used generalized Whitehead doubles by Corollary 3.4. This should be compared to the main result of [KP16], which showed that the knots $\{\mathrm{Wh}^+(RHT)_{n,1}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ form a basis for an infinite rank summand of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lastly, we investigate the case of cables of knots with vanishing τ–invariant but non-vanishing υ–invariant (recall that for a knot K, $\upsilon(K) = \Upsilon_K(1)$).

Proposition 5.23. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) = 0$ and $\upsilon(K) \neq 0$. Then the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ is in $\left(0, \frac{1}{p}\right)$ for any $p \geq 2$.*

Proof. First we consider the case when $\upsilon(K) < 0$. Note that $\upsilon(K)$ is an integer by [OSS14, Proposition 1.3], and thus if $\upsilon(K) < 0$ then $\upsilon(K) \leq -1$. Suppose that $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ does not have a singularity in $\left(0, \frac{1}{p}\right)$, i.e. $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\tau(K_{p,q}) \cdot t$ on $\left(0, \frac{1}{p}\right]$.

If $\varepsilon(K) = 1$, we know that $\tau(K_{p,q}) = p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2} = \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}$ from Proposition 5.1, and thus,

$$\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}t$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{p}$. By Chen's inequality (5.1), for $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{p}$,

$$-\frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}t \leq \Upsilon_K(pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}t.$$

When $t = \frac{1}{p}$, we see that $0 \leq \upsilon(K)$ which is a contradiction, since $\upsilon(K) \leq -1$.

If $\varepsilon(K) = -1$, we know that $\tau(K_{p,q}) = p\tau(K) + \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2} = \frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}$ from Proposition 5.1, and thus,

$$\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}(t) = -\frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{p}$. By Chen's inequality (5.1), for $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{p}$,

$$-\frac{(p-1)(q+1)}{2}t \leq \Upsilon_K(pt) - \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{2}t.$$

When $t = \frac{1}{p}$ we have,

$$-\frac{p-1}{p} \leq \upsilon(K)$$

which is a contradiction, since $p \geq 2$ and $\upsilon(K) \leq -1$.

If $\varepsilon(K) = 0$, the proof is the same as the proof for the $\varepsilon(K) = 1$ case if $q > 0$ and is the same as the proof for the $\varepsilon(K) = -1$ case if $q < 0$, by Proposition 5.1.



FIGURE 4. For the leftmost full twist in a $(2i, q)$ cabling pattern, perform the non-orientable band sum shown above. Since this non-orientable band sum occurs on the torus the resulting pattern is still a cabling pattern, and further by simply counting the winding number we see that the resulting pattern is a $(2i', q')$ cabling pattern for some $i' < i$.

When $\upsilon(K) > 0$, the proof follows from the above by using $-K$, since $\upsilon(-K) = -\upsilon(K) < 0$. □

We have the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 5.24. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) = 0$ and $\upsilon(K) \neq 0$ such that the first singularity of Υ_K occurs at t_0. If N is the smallest integer such that $N > \frac{1}{t_0}$, then K and $K_{p,q}$ are linearly independent in $\mathcal{C}$ for any $p \geq N$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.23, the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p,q}}$ occurs in $\left(0, \frac{1}{p}\right)$. Since $p \geq N > \frac{1}{t_0}$, we see that $\frac{1}{p} < t_0$, and thus we can use Lemma 2.5. □

Corollary 5.25. *Let K be a knot with $\tau(K) = 0$ and $\upsilon(K) \neq 0$. Then there exists a sequence of positive integers $\{p_i\}$ and non-zero integers $\{q_i\}$ such that $\{K_{p_i,q_i}\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.23, the first singularity of $\Upsilon_{K_{p_i,q_i}}$ occurs in $\left(0, \frac{1}{p_i}\right)$ and we can choose p_i such that $\frac{1}{p_i}$ is arbitrarily small. Choose any q_i such that $(p_i, q_1) = 1$. □

Remark 5.26. In Corollary 5.25, we could have chosen K to be a topologically slice knot. If $\varepsilon(K) = 1$ or 0, choose $q_i = 1$ and if $\varepsilon(K) = -1$ choose $q_i = -1$ for all i. Then each element in the set $\{K_{p_i,q_i}\}$ has vanishing τ–invariant and each element is topologically slice (in particular, the signature σ vanishes). Further any two elements in this set have identical ε invariant (see [Hom14, Theorem 2]), even though they are linearly independent in $\mathcal{T}$ by the above result.

The following lemma produces several topologically slice knots which satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 5.23.

Lemma 5.27. *Let K be any topologically slice Υ-simple knot with $\varepsilon(K) = 1$ and $\tau(K) > 0$. Let $J_n = 2nK\# - K_{2n,1}$. Then J_n is a topologically slice knot with $\tau(J_n) = 0$ and $\upsilon(J_n) < 0$, for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.1, $\tau(K_{2n,1}) = 2n\tau(K)$, and hence $\tau(J_n) = \tau(2nK\# - K_{2n,1}) = 2n\tau(K) - \tau(K_{2n,1}) = 0$. Note that since K is Υ-simple, $\upsilon(K) = -\tau(K) < 0$.

By performing the (non-orientable) band sum shown in Figure 4, and the fact that any $(2, n)$ cabling pattern bounds a Möbius band, it is easy to verify that $\gamma_4(K_{2n,1}) \leq n$ (see also [Bat14, Section 4]). Then by Proposition 2.2(10), we have the following inequality.

$$\left|\upsilon(K_{2n,1}) - \frac{\sigma(K_{2n,1})}{2}\right| \leq \gamma_4(K_{2n,1}) \leq n$$

Since K is topologically slice $\sigma(K_{2,1}) = \sigma(K) = 0$, where we use Proposition 5.2. Thus, we see that

$$-\upsilon(K_{2n,1}) \leq n$$

and thus,

$$\upsilon(J_n) = 2n\upsilon(K) - \upsilon(K_{2n,1}) = -2n\tau(K) - \upsilon(K_{2n,1}) \leq -2n\tau(K) + n.$$

Thus $\upsilon(J_n) < 0$ since $\tau(K) > 0$ and $n \geq 1$. □

This gives the following corollary, where we only consider the case $q = \pm 1$ since it is the most interesting.

Corollary 5.28. *Let K be an Υ–simple topologically slice knot with $\tau(K) > 0$ and $g_4(K) = \tau(K)$. Let $J_n = 2nK\# - K_{2n,1}$, then $\{J_n, (J_n)_{p,\pm 1}\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{T}$ for any $p > 2n$.*

Proof. Note that $\Upsilon_{J_n = 2nK\# - K_{2n,1}}$ has its first singularity in $\left[\frac{1}{2n}, \frac{2\tau(K)}{2n\tau(K)-(2n-1)}\right]$ by Proposition 5.7, where we use the fact that K is Υ–simple and Proposition 2.2(1). Then the result follows from Corollary 5.24 and Lemma 5.27. □

Note that several knots satisfy the requirements of the above corollary; for instance, we can take $K = \mathrm{Wh}^+(K')$ where $\tau(K') > 0$. When $K = \mathrm{Wh}^+(RHT)$ we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.29. *Let $K = \mathrm{Wh}^+(RHT)$. Let $J_n = 2nK\# - K_{2n,1}$. Then $\{J_n, (J_n)_{p,\pm 1}\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{T}$ for any $p > \frac{1+2n}{2}$. In particular $\{J_1, (J_1)_{p,\pm 1}\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{T}$ for any $p \geq 2$.*

Proof. For the most part this follows from Corollary 5.28. We can do a bit better since by [KP16, Theorem C] and Proposition 2.2(1), Υ_{J_n} has its first singularity at $\frac{2}{1+2n}$. Then we can follow the proof of Corollary 5.28. □

References

[Bat14] Joshua Batson. Nonorientable slice genus can be arbitrarily large. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 21(3):423–436, 2014.

[CDR14] Tim D. Cochran, Christopher W. Davis, and Arunima Ray. Injectivity of satellite operators in knot concordance. *Journal of Topology*, 7(4):948–964, 2014.

[CFHH13] Tim D. Cochran, Bridget D. Franklin, Matthew Hedden, and Peter D. Horn. Knot concordance and homology cobordism. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 141(6):2193–2208, 2013.

[Che16] Wenzhao Chen. On the upsilon invariant of cable knots. Preprint, available at https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.04760, 2016.

[CHL11] Tim D. Cochran, Shelly Harvey, and Constance Leidy. Primary decomposition and the fractal nature of knot concordance. *Math. Ann.*, 351(2):443–508, 2011.

[End95] Hisaaki Endo. Linear independence of topologically slice knots in the smooth cobordism group. *Topology Appl.*, 63(3):257–262, 1995.

[Hed07] Matthew Hedden. Knot Floer homology of Whitehead doubles. *Geom. Topol.*, 11:2277–2338, 2007.

[HK12] Matthew Hedden and Paul Kirk. Instantons, concordance, and Whitehead doubling. *J. Differential Geom.*, 91(2):281–319, 2012.

[Hom14] Jennifer Hom. Bordered Heegaard Floer homology and the tau-invariant of cable knots. *J. Topol.*, 7(2):287–326, 2014.

[Hom15] Jennifer Hom. An infinite-rank summand of topologically slice knots. *Geom. Topol.*, 19(2):1063–1110, 2015.

[Kir97] Rob Kirby, editor. *Problems in low-dimensional topology*, volume 2 of *AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math.* Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.

[KP16] Min Hoon Kim and Kyungbae Park. An infinite-rank summand of knots with trivial alexander polynomial. Preprint, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1604.04037, 2016.

[Lev12] Adam Simon Levine. Knot doubling operators and bordered Heegaard Floer homology. *J. Topol.*, 5(3):651–712, 2012.

[Lev14] Adam Simon Levine. Non-surjective satellite operators and piecewise-linear concordance. Preprint, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1405.1125, 2014.

[Lit79] R. A. Litherland. Signatures of iterated torus knots. In *Topology of low-dimensional manifolds (Proc. Second Sussex Conf., Chelwood Gate, 1977)*, volume 722 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 71–84. Springer, Berlin, 1979.

[OS03] Peter Ozsváth and Zoltán Szabó. Knot Floer homology and the four-ball genus. *Geom. Topol.*, 7:615–639, 2003.

[OSS14] Peter S. Ozváth, András I. Stipsicz, and Zoltán Szabó. Concordance homomorphisms from knot floer homology. Preprint: http://arxiv.org/abs/1407.1795, 2014.

[OSS15] Peter S. Ozváth, András I. Stipsicz, and Zoltán Szabó. Unoriented knot floer homology and the unoriented four-ball genus. Preprint: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1508.03243.pdf, 2015.

[Ray15] Arunima Ray. Satellite operators with distinct iterates in smooth concordance. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 143(11):5005–5020, 2015.

[Wan15] S. Wang. On the first singularity for the upsilon invariant of algebraic knots. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2015. ArXvi:1505.06835 [math.GT].

[Yas14] Kouichi Yasui. Corks, exotic 4-manifolds and knot concordance. preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.02551, 2014.

Department of Mathematics, Boston College
E-mail address: peter.feller@math.ch
URL: https://www2.bc.edu/peter-feller-2/

Department of Mathematics, Rice University
E-mail address: jp35@rice.edu
URL: http://math.rice.edu/~jp35/

Department of Mathematics, Brandeis University
E-mail address: aruray@brandeis.edu
URL: http://people.brandeis.edu/~aruray/